

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-2575

**REOPENING NOTICE FOR
FY 2001 APPLICATION KIT FOR NEW GRANTS
UNDER
THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DISABILITY AND
REHABILITATION RESEARCH**

**NEW DISABILITY AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH
PROJECTS**

CFDA NUMBER: 84.133A

Resource Center for Community-based Research on Technology for Independence, and
Community-based Research Projects on Technology for Independence)



FORM APPROVED
OMB No. 1820-0027, EXP. DATE 2/28/2003
ED FORM 424, 11/30/2004

DATED MATERIAL - OPEN IMMEDIATELY

CLOSING DATE: APRIL 15, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>SECTION</u>
Notice of Reopening	A
Notice of Final Competitive Preference Points	B
Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards and Pre-Application Meetings..... (note: there will not be a pre-application meeting, please call or email with questions)	C
<u>Selection Criteria</u> for the Resource Center for Community-based Research on Technology for Independence.....	D
<u>Selection Criteria</u> for the Community-based Research Projects on Technology for Independence	E
<u>Additional Selection Criteria to be used on all the priorities</u>	F
Frequently Asked Questions & Points to Remember in Application Preparation.....	G
Application Transmittal Instructions	H
Instructions for Application	I
Part I: Federal Assistance Face Page (424)	
Part II: Budget Information	
Part III: Application Narrative	
Part IV: Assurances, Certifications, Disclosures	
• Assurances - Non-Construction Programs;	
• Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters, and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements;	
• Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transaction;	
• Disclosure of Lobbying Activities;	
DUNS Number Instructions.....	J
Application Checklist.....	K

4000-01-U

CDFA Nos.: 84.133A-18 and 84.133A-19

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

AGENCY: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative
Services, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice reopening application deadline date.

SUMMARY: On June 26, 2001, the Office of Special Education and
Rehabilitative Services, National Institute on Disability and
Rehabilitation Research published a notice in the Federal
Register (66 FR 34034) inviting applications for new FY 2001
grant awards for four Disability and Rehabilitation Research
Projects and Centers Program (DRRP) priority areas. The intent
of this notice is to reopen the competition for two of the
priority areas: Resource Center for Community-based Research on
Technology for Independence (CFDA 84.133A-18) and Community-
based Research Projects on Technology for Independence (CFDA
84.133A-19).

DEADLINE FOR TRANSMITTAL OF APPLICATIONS: April 15, 2002.

Note to Applicants: The information provided in the Notice of
Final Priorities published on June 26, 2001 (66 FR 34026)
identifies the requirements for applications submitted in

response to this notice. The information in this notice remains the same except that the CFDA numbers for the competition have been changed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donna Nangle, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3412, Switzer Building, Washington, DC 20202-2645.

Telephone: (202) 205-5880 or via the Internet:

donna.nangle@ed.gov

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the TDD number at (202) 205-4475.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may review this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site:

www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC, area at (202) 512-1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/NIDRR/Policy/>

PROGRAM AUTHORITY: 29 U.S.C. 762(g) and 764(b).

Dated: February 8, 2002

Loretta L. Petty,
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Special Education and
Rehabilitative Services.

SECTION B

4000-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

AGENCY: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative
Services, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of Final Funding Priorities for Fiscal Years
2001-2003 for four Disability and Rehabilitation Research
Projects.

SUMMARY: We are announcing four final funding priorities under
the Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers
Program (DRRP) of the National Institute on Disability and
Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) for FY 2001-2003: Assistive
Technology Outcomes, Impacts and Assistive Technology Research
Projects for Individuals with Cognitive Disabilities, Resource
Center for Community-based Research on Technology for
Independence, and Community-based Research Projects on
Technology for Independence. We take this action to focus
research attention on areas of national need. We intend these
priorities to improve the rehabilitation services and outcomes
for individuals with disabilities.

DATE: These priorities take effect on July 26, 2001

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donna Nangle. Telephone: (202) 205-5880. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the TDD number at (202) 205-4475. Internet: Donna.Nangle@ed.gov

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

This notice contains final priorities under the Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program (DRRP) for Assistive Technology Outcomes, Impacts and Assistive Technology Research Projects for Individuals with Cognitive Disabilities, Resource Center for Community-based Research on Technology for Independence, and Community-based Research Projects on Technology for Independence.

The final priorities refer to NIDRR's Long-Range Plan (the Plan). The Plan can be accessed on the World Wide Web at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/NIDRR/>.

National Education Goals

The eight National Education Goals focus the Nation's education reform efforts and provide a framework for improving teaching and learning.

This notice addresses the National Education Goal that every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

The authority for the program to establish research priorities by reserving funds to support particular research activities is contained in sections 202(g) and 204 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 762(g) and 764(b)). Regulations governing this program are found in 34 CFR part 350.

NOTE: This notice does not solicit applications. A notice inviting applications is published in this issue of the Federal Register.

Analysis of Comments and Changes

On April 6, 2001, we published a notice of proposed priorities on the Assistive Technology Outcomes and Impacts and the Assistive Technology Research Projects for Individuals with Cognitive Disabilities in the Federal Register (66 FR 18366). The Department of Education received 12 letters commenting on the notice of proposed priorities by the deadline date. Technical and other minor changes -- and suggested changes we are not legally authorized to make under statutory authority -- are not addressed.

Priority 1: Assistive Technology Outcomes and Impacts

Comment: The primary stakeholder regarding AT outcomes is the person who uses (or is expected to use) a particular AT device. Family members and caregivers are secondary consumers, however, they may be considered primary stakeholders in the sense that two thirds of all AT is procured through first party and family funding. Therefore, it is crucial that this priority require applicants to focus on the individual with a disability rather than other primary and secondary stakeholders.

Discussion: NIDRR feels the priority is sufficiently flexible to allow the applicant to propose methodological approaches that focus on the needs of primary stakeholders such as individuals with disabilities. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposal.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter is concerned about using the word "intervention" in the general purpose statement suggesting that it is a poor choice of words and may be misinterpreted. The commenter recommends dropping the word altogether so that the last sentence of the general purpose statement reads ".... determine the efficacy and utility of AT and the implications."

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that the term "interventions" may be misconstrued because of varying definitions and interpretations.

Changes: The word "interventions" has been dropped from the general purpose statement.

Comment: The second bulleted activity lists a number of relevant organizations that applicants must collaborate with. Given that AT users are the primary targets of this priority, this bulleted activity should be expanded to include AT users.

Discussion: The second bulleted activity enumerates relevant NIDRR projects and not specific stakeholders. The purpose of this priority is to investigate AT outcomes and impacts and cannot be carried out without the full participation and support of AT users.

Changes: None.

Comment: The assessment and evaluation of AT should include questions related to both positive and negative impacts of AT use and the acquisition of AT through various financial means.

Discussion: Economic and cost factors, as well as positive and negative outcomes, of AT use are discussed in the background statement. An applicant can propose methodological approaches to measure outcomes and impacts that take into account both positive and negative impacts of AT use and the acquisition of AT through various financial means and the peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposal.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter feels that the application of AT to specific populations (such as frail elderly persons, infants and toddlers, and their care providers) should be examined in terms of financial benefits to individuals and care systems as well as functional outcomes for individuals.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees with the commenter that an examination of the application of AT to specific populations and its impact on care systems as well as individuals is critical to the development of useful measurement systems and this was mentioned in the background statement. An applicant may propose to examine the financial benefits to individuals and care systems as well as functional outcomes for individuals with disabilities and the peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposal.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that long-term outcomes need to be addressed specifically. Preliminary research indicates that the use of AT will delay institutionalization and, along with personal attendant services, will maintain a person in a relatively independent state for a given period of time. For people with significant disabilities, including those with Alzheimer's and other dementia diseases who use assistive

devices, it may be useful and instructive to discover the long-term effects of reliance on AT for independent living.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that maintaining an independent life style for as long as possible is critical for all people and that the use of AT plays an important role in independent living. The background statement and the priority support the commenter's contention. An applicant may propose ways to measure the impact of AT on maintaining independence in its application and the peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposal.

Changes: None.

Comment: The cost-benefit of AT on healthcare is an essential impact question. Efforts to evaluate the appropriate use of AT and its financial benefits to insurance providers (both public and private) are essential. Related to this issue is the impact of managed care systems on the appropriate provision of AT to persons with disabilities. The positive or negative effects of this type of delivery system should be investigated in terms of long-term health outcome, including the reduction of time spent in healthcare institutions, for individuals with disabilities.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that there are a myriad of issues related to the cost, economics, and financial benefits of AT.

An applicant may propose to investigate issues related to the cost, economics, and financial benefits of AT and the peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposal.

Changes: None.

Comment: The same commenter believes that the impact of expanding approved lists of durable medical equipment through DMERCs on individual outcomes should also be assessed.

Discussion: Developing lists of approved durable medical equipment through DMERCs and assessing their impact on individual outcomes is beyond the scope of this priority.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter cites the need to develop methods and standards of practice to help organizations monitor the quality of services and outcomes.

Discussion: Developing methods and standards of practice for organizational monitoring of quality assurance is beyond the scope of this priority.

Changes: None.

Comment: The same commenter feels that three levels of information must be measured; the impact of AT on the individual, the impact on the community and how and in what context the service was delivered.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that these are important dimensions of

AT use and addressed these factors in the background statement. An applicant may propose ways to measure the different levels of impact of the provision of AT on the consumer, on the community, and the context in which the AT was provided. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposal.

Changes: None.

Priority 2: Assistive Technology Research Projects for Individuals with Cognitive Disabilities

Comment: Four commenters suggest that an activity should be added to the priority requiring applicants to investigate ways of making the Internet accessible to people with cognitive disabilities.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that access to the Internet, and therefore, information is extremely important for persons with cognitive disabilities. An applicant could propose to investigate ways to make the Internet more accessible for persons with cognitive disabilities and the peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposal.

Changes: None.

Priority 3: Resource Center for Community-based Research for Independence; Priority 4: Community-based Research Projects on Technology for Independence

On April 6, 2001, we published a notice of proposed

priorities in the Federal Register (66 FR 18360). The Department of Education received 14 letters commenting on the notice of proposed priorities by the deadline date. Many of the comments concerned both priorities, raised multiple issues and suggestions, and overlapped with other comments. NIDRR is responding to the comments on priority one and priority two jointly. As a group, the comments indicated a need to clarify the purposes and expectations for these priorities and to explain some of the legislative and regulatory constraints under which they were proposed. Technical and other minor changes -- and suggested changes we are not legally authorized to make under statutory authority -- are not addressed.

General Comments

Comment: Several commenters suggested that each project be required to address a variety of different topics, such as rural areas, effects of technology on health outcomes, specific disability populations, such as deaf individuals, caregivers, or families.

Discussion: A major purpose of this program is to address issues, within the general area of access to appropriate technology, that are identified as important by individuals with disabilities. This priority is concerned generally with research on understanding potential roles for community-based

disability organizations in research on increasing access to Assistive Technology (AT) and systems technology, and with developing partnerships and research strategies for use by community-based disability organizations. NIDRR elects not to further constrict the selection of problems for study. Applicants may elect to study issues of single disability populations or cross-disability concerns, and may target any populations relevant to improving access to technology, including families, caregivers, professional service providers, product distributors, or others. It is up to the applicants to convince the peer reviewers of the importance of the problem they elect to address.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters discussed the definition of community-based disability organization and of consumer control. The gist of these comments related to either: declaring certain types of organizations (e.g., University Affiliated Programs, now named University Centers of Excellence, or facility-based employment programs) to be community-based organizations; restricting the competition to consumer-directed organizations; or declaring various types of organizations to be either eligible or ineligible for the competition. One commenter

argued that the intent to "involve community disability organizations" is objectionable, and that grants should be made only to grassroots organizations, and not universities.

Discussion: NIDRR does not have the authority to restrict eligibility for the DRRP competition beyond that specified in the statute. The regulations specify that any public or private organization, whether nonprofit or for-profit, institution of higher education, or Indian tribe or tribal organization, is eligible to apply for a grant in this program. Since the purpose of this priority is to build research capacity in community-based disability organizations to study problems of access to technology, NIDRR requires in the priority that any application to be funded must include a community-based disability organization, either as sole applicant or as a partner in the endeavor. According to the priority, "A community-based disability organization is a consumer-directed disability organization...consumer control is the key." While NIDRR regulations do not define these terms, regulations for the Independent Living Programs, also funded under the Rehabilitation Act, as amended, define "consumer control" to mean that "a center or eligible agency vests power and authority in individuals with disabilities..." [34 CFR 364.4(b)]. Further, dictionary definitions and the sense of this priority

indicate that community-based organizations are not institution-based, and that disability organizations are those of, by, and for persons with disabilities. It will be up to the peer reviewers in applying the selection criteria to judge how well an application responds to the purposes of the priority of building research capacity in community-based disability organizations and works through community-based disability organizations to "...broaden the inclusion of persons with disabilities in developing practical and affordable solutions to AT and environmental access problems and needs".

Changes. None.

Comment: Several commenters discussed standards and requirements for AT to be developed under these grants. At the same time, other commenters pointed out that there were many barriers to access beyond the development of new technology.

Discussion: The priority does not address development of technology, but rather research on improved access to technology. Applicants could propose to develop new technology or devices if the project met the basic purposes of building research capacity in community-based disability organizations by addressing issues of increasing access to technology, both individual AT and systems (environmental access). However, NIDRR does not anticipate that development of new technology

will be the focus of all, or even any, of these projects. Issues of improving access also include distribution, diagnosis and prescription, funding, maintenance, training, and other problems. Potential applicants are referred to both the NIDRR Long-Range Plan (1999) and the Blueprint for the Millennium: An Analysis of Regional Hearings on Assistive Technology for People with Disabilities (1998) for discussions of the complex issues in technology access for individuals with disabilities. It is up to the applicants to convince the peer reviewers of the importance of the problem they elect to address.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters asked that additional NIDRR centers or entities funded from other sources be specified as resources for cooperation in the priority.

Discussion: The priority states, "Coordinate with appropriate federally-funded projects." The priority then provides examples of what may be included. It is not feasible or necessary to list all potential cooperators, and astute applicants will survey the field to identify the most appropriate organizations for coordination to advance the success of their proposed projects.

Changes. None.

Comment: One commenter requested a clarification of the meaning of "environmental access" and whether it applies only to AT, or could include other environmental issues.

Discussion: The priority refers to AT and environmental access. The Plan refers to technology to improve function and technology to improve access to the built environment. Modifications to the physical and telecommunications environments, including applications of universal design, may include architectural modifications, signage for persons with sensory or cognitive limitations, and public transit modifications that enable persons with disabilities to access the broader environment.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter stated that there should be a requirement that every applicant must indicate how they are developing research capacity among individuals with disabilities.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that this is an important aspect of the projects and has added language in the priority to this effect.

Changes: The language "applicants must describe how they will develop research capacity among individuals with disabilities at the community level" has been inserted as paragraph (c) in the final section of both priorities.

Comment: One commenter noted that although dissemination of project findings through electronic media is often effective, it would be inappropriate to limit the dissemination of findings to electronic media and that accessible electronic media in combination with other accessible media should be used.

Discussion: Selection criteria for dissemination activities address appropriateness of dissemination approaches and that such methods are accessible to individuals with various disabilities.

Changes: None.

Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program

The authority for Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRP) is contained in section 204 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 762(g) and 764(b)). The purpose of the DRRP program is to plan and conduct research, demonstration projects, training, and related activities to --

(a) Develop methods, procedures, and rehabilitation technology that maximizes the full inclusion and integration into society, employment, independent living, family support, and economic and social self-sufficiency of individuals with disabilities; and

(b) Improve the effectiveness of services authorized under the Act.

Priority 1: Assistive Technology Outcomes and Impacts

Background

One of the greatest challenges facing health care systems, social services providers and policymakers is to ensure that scarce resources are used efficiently. To a large extent, this challenge explains the growing interest in outcomes research and evidence-based medicine. Particular interest in outcomes of assistive technology (AT) is related to the amount of dollars spent on developing and manufacturing AT and AT service delivery and to the need to improve the functional independence and well-being of persons with disabilities of all ages. Yet, assessment of the impact of technology on function and other productivity and quality of life outcomes lags behind outcomes measurement in other areas of rehabilitation.

There are several factors that promote concern about the paucity of outcomes research in AT including the: (a) ability to demonstrate efficacy of new devices; (b) need to examine effectiveness of devices over time; and (c) need to chart future research and development to improve devices (Fuhrer, M. J., "Assistive technology outcomes research: challenges met and yet unmet," American Journal of Physical Medicine and

Rehabilitation, 2001, In press). Outcomes research and analysis is also needed to guide decisionmaking across multiple levels of policy and program development, including: (a) decisions on a societal level regarding types of public programs and services to fund; (b) decisions on a programmatic level regarding what services to continue, enhance, modify or eliminate; (c) decisions on an individual level regarding AT recommendations and interventions; and (d) decisions on a research level regarding the comparative effectiveness of individual devices and the impact on future designs (Smith, R., "Measuring the outcomes of assistive technology: challenge and innovation", Assistive Technology, Vol. 8, No. 2, pgs. 71-81, 1996).

In the face of a growing interest in outcomes, the inconsistent use of terminology contributes to the confusion that exists in the application of a generally accepted outcomes approach. In the field of rehabilitation, outcomes measurement has focused on creating outcomes management systems and measuring and communicating outcomes. Rehabilitation has led the health care field in its emphasis on changes in function as an outcomes measure. Still, even in rehabilitation, outcomes measurement systems have typically focused on process variables, i.e., the outputs of products and services, and not on gains to the individual or society in either the short or long term.

Wilkerson posits that this emphasis on process will change because of three factors: (a) the pressure to cut costs; (b) growth of consumerism leading to increased input from users and increased focus on the needs of the end user; and (c) concerns about quality in relation to costs (Wilkerson, D., "Outcomes and accreditation-The paradigm is shifting toward outcome," Rehab Management, August/September, pgs. 112-115, 1997).

Outcomes research is defined in different ways across rehabilitation and health services research as well as in the social services field. The Foundation for Health Services Research (Foundation for Health Services Research, Health Outcomes Research: A Primer, Washington, DC, 1994) characterized outcomes research as research focused on the "end results of medical care -- the effect of the health care process on the health and well-being of patients and populations." The Institute of Medicine (IOM) (Feasley, J.C., ed., Health Outcomes for Older People: Questions for the Coming Decade, Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1996) expanded this definition to include "the clinical signs and symptoms, well-being or mental and emotional functioning; physical, cognitive, and social functioning; satisfaction with care; health-related quality of life, and costs and appropriate use of resources." Outcomes research has also been defined as research designed to discover

the sustained impact of rehabilitative strategies and treatments in the everyday lives of persons with disabilities. "Outcomes research attempts to build a bridge between interventions and long-term improvements in the lives of persons served as they reenter the community" (Johnston, M., et al., "Outcomes research in medical rehabilitation-foundations from the past and directions for the future," Assessing Medical Rehabilitation Practices: The Promise of Outcomes Research, Marcus J. Fuhrer, ed., pgs. 1-42, 1997). Regardless of how it is defined, outcomes research is part of the larger framework of program evaluation (Fuhrer, op cit., 1997), and includes both outcomes analysis and outcomes measurement also known as performance measurement (Jennings, B.M. and Staggers, N., The language of outcomes, Journal of Rehabilitation Outcomes Measurement, Vol. 3, No.1, pgs. 59-64, 1999).

Rehabilitation outcomes are changes produced by rehabilitation services in the lives of service recipients and their environments. Outcome indicators are measures of the amount and frequency of those occurrences, and include service quality. Within this perspective, some analysts use the word "impacts" to distinguish between long-term outcomes or end results that occur on a societal versus an individual level. Still others use the term "impact" more strictly to refer to

estimates of the extent to which the program actually "caused" particular outcomes (Hatry, H. et al., Customer Surveys for agency managers: What Managers Need to Know, Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 1998). Deconstructing these various definitions and types of outcomes and impacts requires recognition of complexity on many levels.

Although AT has grown as a discipline and as an industry over the past two decades, there has not been a corresponding maturity in developing or assessing the outcomes or impacts of AT upon individuals with disabilities. AT devices and services outcomes also may be difficult to define because of the ways AT is used. For example, AT is used to increase participation in the environment, enhance normative social roles, promote and sustain employment, and facilitate activities of daily living. Some devices, such as computers, increase access to information and support life long learning. AT devices vary significantly from highly complex and sophisticated computer-operated systems to low tech approaches that can be easily purchased or built. Complicating the issue even further are the individual characteristics of the AT user and the varied environments in which users live, work, and learn.

Approximately one-third of AT devices will be abandoned by the user (Phillips, B. and Zhao, H. "Predictors of assistive

technology abandonment", Assistive Technology, Vol. 5, pgs. 36-45, 1995). There are many reasons why individuals with disabilities choose to accept or reject AT devices. Since public funds provide a major source for purchasing AT devices and services, useful and accurate measures of outcomes and impacts is critical for accountability and to avoid wasteful outcomes. Is abandonment a negative or could it be a positive outcome? Abandonment has been viewed as the end result of fragmented service provision, poor assessment techniques, lack of consumer choice in device selection, inattention to device use across environments, inadequate training, costly repairs, need to upgrade and obsolete or inappropriate technology. However, abandonment may be a natural phenomenon related to improved physical or cognitive function, the result of a technology upgrade or because different technology is a better fit between the end-user and the environment.

There are other reasons to account for the lack of momentum in measurement development and outcomes and impact research on AT. Most of the endorsements of a particular device or service are based on anecdotal information (Fuhrer, 1999) rather than data generated from research. Frank DeRuyter ("Evaluating outcomes in assistive technology: do we understand the commitment," Assistive Technology, Vol.7, No. 1, pgs. 3-16,

1995), observed that historically, AT was considered a remedy to impairment or dysfunction, and the urgency of consumer need was of greater importance than relying upon data to document the efficacy of a particular device. In addition, quality was perceived as too abstract and difficult to measure and define. Vendors and practitioners may feel threatened by potential findings and accountability demands, which may also have contributed to the lack of outcomes studies (DeRuyter, op. cit, 1995).

While the AT arena is complex and broad, several outcomes studies have focused on a discrete segment of the entire system. Smith says that there are essentially two domains of outcome measurement: the performance of an individual using assistive technology and the cost of achieving the level of performance (Smith, R. O., "Accountability in assistive technology interventions: measuring outcomes," Volume I - RESNA Resource Guide of Assistive Technology Outcomes: Measurement Tools, pgs. 15-43, 1998). Minkel proposed that the primary measure to determine the value of the assistive technology is the basic formula of outcomes divided by cost (Minkel, J., "Assistive technology and outcomes measurement: Where do we begin?" Technology and Disability, July, pgs. 285-288, 1996). There are others within the AT community who operate under the assumption

that improvements and innovation in technology will "naturally" lead to successful use and implementation, and therefore do not need to be evaluated. From this perspective, technological solutions have been viewed as a panacea without the benefit of data to support prevailing assumptions (De Ruyter, F., "Concepts and rationale for accountability in assistive technology,"

Volume I - RESNA Resource Guide of Assistive Technology

Outcomes: Measurement Tools, pgs. 2-15, 1998).

At a minimum, the process of evaluating AT outcomes must measure and establish a baseline of what works, identify how well and for whom it works, and at what level of economy and efficiency. This process will necessitate taking information from several performance monitoring dimensions (De Ruyter, op. cit., 1998). In approaching the challenges of AT outcomes measurement, it is important to identify if the outcomes relate to the AT product or service, the user, or to the environment in which the technology is being used. While not standardized or widely endorsed, a variety of measurement techniques and instruments are currently utilized. These measurement tools tend to be specific to a given practice area or limited to a functional domain, (Volume I: RESNA - Resource Guide for Assistive Technology Outcomes: Measurement Tools, 1998).

To proceed with assessing AT outcomes and impacts, the

following questions need to be addressed. First, what are the key gaps and weaknesses in our knowledge of AT use and its impacts? Are the key research questions related to a particular intervention at a particular point in time? How do device modifications and upgrades change the intervention? How do characteristics of the population including severity of impairment, duration of disability, presence of co-morbidities, aging and other sociodemographic factors influence technology utilization and bias outcomes study? What is the role of environmental, economic, awareness and training barriers in AT use and outcomes? These different levels of outcomes can look at impacts and effects of technology at one point in time, more typically a clinical or functional outcome, or can be examined in terms of long-term impacts on individual quality of life, productivity and social participation. As one researcher expressed it, in addition to longitudinal studies, "the research agenda must consider lifelong use of assistive technology, documenting effectiveness of that technology as an intervention, identifying stages for reconsideration of its use, and defining environmental and social considerations" (Turk, M. A., "Early development-related condition," Assessing Medical Rehabilitation Practices-The Promise of Outcomes Research, Marcus J. Fuhrer, ed., pgs. 367-392, 1997).

Innovations in AT will continue to evolve and many AT users, as they have in the recent past, will experience increases in independence, function, and general well being. Concurrently, the gap between the promise of technology and the ability of individuals and funding sources to afford them will continue to widen. This will result in a greater need for knowledge about the cost-effectiveness and efficiency of particular devices and services (Fuhrer, M.J., "Assistive technology outcomes research: challenges met and yet unmet," American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 2001, In press).

Priority 1

We will establish multiple research projects on AT outcomes and impacts to determine the efficacy and utility of AT and the implications for abandonment of AT devices. In carrying out these purposes, the projects must:

(a) Assess the current status of AT outcomes and impacts measurement systems and approaches, identifying measurement methodologies, characteristics of key instruments including utility to AT field, and critical gaps in measurement;

(b) Based upon the findings of paragraph (a), evaluate efficacy of existing measurement instruments or develop and evaluate new outcomes and impacts measurement methodologies to

meet the needs of AT stakeholders; and

(c) Investigate and analyze the complexity of factors contributing to the abandonment of AT, including age-related changes, and identify how these factors are incorporated into outcomes and impacts measurement instruments.

In addition to activities proposed by the applicants to carry out these purposes, each project must:

- Develop and disseminate to AT stakeholders and other interested and relevant audiences, as determined by NIDRR, materials on AT outcomes studies and impacts analyses and, periodic updates on the project's milestones, products and results; and
- Collaborate with relevant NIDRR-sponsored projects, such as the AT/IT Consumer Survey (University of Michigan), the RESNA Technical Assistance projects, and the RRTC on Medical Rehabilitation Outcomes, as identified through consultation with the NIDRR Project Officer.

Priority 2: Assistive Technology Research Projects for Individuals with Cognitive Disabilities

Background

Technology and assistive devices have commonly been used to assist persons with mobility, communication and sensory difficulties. Because of the positive impact that technology

has played in the lives of these individuals, there is now a strong push toward the development of such devices for people with cognitive disabilities. The Assistive Technology Act of 1998 defines an AT device to be any item, piece of equipment or product system whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified or customized that is used to increase, maintain or improve functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities. Rapid advances in technology provide great potential for development of new devices or adaptation of available devices to assist individuals with cognitive disabilities to develop and maintain skills.

Technology professionals, such as computer scientists and rehabilitation engineers, have limited experience applying AT solutions to users with cognitive disabilities. Nor do they yet understand the mapping between specific needs and equally specific design solutions. Most people with cognitive disabilities have a range of learning and processing capabilities. Wide variations in cognitive functioning make it difficult to develop generic solutions appropriate for all individuals. Functional capabilities associated with these disabilities may include wide ranges of ability in memory, reasoning, and language comprehension. Cognitive functioning also includes perception, problem-solving, conceptualizing,

reading, thinking and sequencing (Electronic and Information Technology Access Advisory Committee, "EITAAC Report, May 13, 1999," A Report to the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board). Common strategies to improve functioning in activities of daily living across various cognitive disabilities need to be identified, as do, issues regarding information processing that may be unique to each of these groups.

Persons with cognitive disabilities often have difficulty in carrying out Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADLs) because of problems with time management and information retrieval. Researchers are experimenting with the use of electronic personal computers to compensate for memory problems. Other researchers are examining methods of matching individual cognitive problems with compensatory strategies provided by a variety of commercially available portable electronic devices. In traumatic brain injury treatment, researchers are investigating the use of virtual reality technology to test visual acuity and reaction times to stimulus. Research is also being conducted on the use of text-based messages to enhance communication.

Technology is often viewed as facilitating employment of persons with disabilities. However, inaccessible technology can be a barrier to all persons with disabilities. This is

particularly true for persons with cognitive impairments who may have difficulty using telephones, computers, and other equipment that are staples of most work environments. Developers and manufacturers of AT often do not consider issues of cognitive access and flexibility when designing their products.

While the congruence between the promise of AT and the needs of many people attempting to achieve community integration is obvious, little has been written about the manner in which technology affects community adaptation or the service needs of individuals with cognitive disabilities in community settings. While specific manifestations of AT have identifiable benefits, the central question needs to be empirically addressed -- how can assistive technologies contribute to community integration and in what manner can the linkage be facilitated? The state of knowledge about the use of AT for persons with cognitive disabilities, as well as the outcomes of that use or lack of use and the cost-effectiveness in achieving community integration is limited. There are only a few large assessments of the technology needs of persons with cognitive disabilities and results are ambiguous because of difficulties in identifying persons with low incidence conditions and specific technology needs within the study population (Lakin, C. et. al., NIDRR Long-Range Plan Commissioned Paper on Community Integration, 1996).

In order to take advantage of any potential that technological advances may have, it is important to define what makes a device easier or more difficult for a person with a cognitive disability to use. Products that are simpler and require fewer cognitive skills are easier to operate for everyone (Vanderheiden, G., 1992, "A brief look at technology and mental retardation in the 21st century," in Mental Retardation in the Year 2000, Louis Rowitz, ed., New York: Springer-Verlag). "Design guidelines" must then be communicated to the manufacturers of consumer products and business information systems. Instructions for training on the use and maintenance of the device also need to be part of this design process. It is important for designers to be aware of the real world tasks with which the user has difficulty; hence, research needs to include persons with cognitive disabilities at the front end of all technology development. End product affordability is important not only in meeting consumer needs, but also in creating the market demand that will encourage manufacturers to enter production.

The NIDRR Long-Range Plan discusses three objectives in developing technology to meet the needs of people with limitations in cognitive functioning: to assure that new technologies are accessible and do not exacerbate exclusion from

mainstream activities; to assist people with cognitive limitations in the performance of daily activities; and to develop technologies that can enhance or restore some cognitive functions (NIDRR, Long-Range Plan: 1999-2003, pg. 57).

The University of Colorado recently accepted a gift of \$250 million. The endowment will fund advanced research and development of innovative technologies to enhance the lives of people with cognitive disabilities. The endowment, to be paid over five years, will be used to establish the Coleman Institute for Cognitive Disabilities located at the University of Colorado. Applicants for this project should provide information on proposed coordination with the Coleman Institute.

Priority 2

We will establish multiple research projects on technology access for persons with cognitive disabilities leading to practical and affordable solutions to identified community and workplace needs of this population. The projects must:

(a) Conduct an assessment of state-of-the-art technology applications for persons with cognitive disabilities;

(b) Based on the assessment results of paragraph (a), identify technology gaps and needs for persons with cognitive disabilities and make recommendations for new technology and modifications to existing technology;

(c) Identify features that may be incorporated into existing, commercially available technology that could benefit persons with cognitive disabilities; and

(d) Develop and explore strategies for strengthening partnerships with developers and manufacturers of devices in order to facilitate the development of new technologies and applications to incorporate cognitive access.

In addition to the activities proposed by the applicants to carry out these purposes, the projects must:

- Coordinate with the appropriate Federal agencies and privately-funded projects, such as the University of Colorado's Coleman Institute for Cognitive Disabilities, that are relevant to the applicants proposed activities as identified through consultation with the NIDRR project officer; and
- Involve individuals with cognitive disabilities in all aspects of the project.

Priorities for Community-based Rehabilitation Projects on Technology for Independence

Background on Issues in Involvement of Community-based Organizations of People with Disabilities in Promoting Technology for Independence.

As stated in the Plan, "It is the mission of NIDRR to generate, disseminate, and promote the full use of new knowledge

that will improve substantially the options for disabled individuals to perform regular activities in the community, and the capacity of society to provide full opportunities and appropriate supports for its disabled citizens." Assistive Technology (AT) and environmental access play key roles in this mission. The Plan provides detailed definitions, examples, and research objectives for AT and environmental access, including universal design.

According to a National Center for Health Statistics report titled "Trends and Differential Use of Assistive Technology Devices: United States, 1994," approximately 17 million people used at least one AT device. AT and related environmental access approaches (environmental access approaches include the concept of universal design) help people with disabilities function on a more equal basis in society. For more information on the contributions of AT and access solutions, see the examples and links to relevant web sites provided by the United States Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, also known as the Access Board (<http://www.access-board.gov/>), and the Doorway to Research on Technology for Access and Function at the National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research (NCDDR) (<http://www.ncddr.org/rpp/techaf/index.html>).

The new paradigm of disability embodied in the Plan requires analysis of the extent to which AT and environmental access helps individuals with disabilities in attaining full participation in society. Much of NIDRR's work reflects the components of the Independent Living (IL) philosophy: consumer control, self-help, advocacy, peer relationships and peer role models, and equal access to society, programs, and activities. IL and achieving community integration to the maximum extent possible are issues at the crux of NIDRR's mission. Furthermore, NIDRR is committed to the creation of a theoretical framework with measurable outcomes that is based upon the experiences of individuals with disabilities.

To improve "end-user" participation in addressing AT problems, and related environmental access solutions, NIDRR will support projects that involve community-based organizations in researching AT related problems and needs. Two types of projects will be supported. The first type includes research projects that will investigate the use of, and need for, AT devices and services at the community level. The second type of project is a community-based research "Resource Center" that will develop, evaluate, and disseminate improved research and training methods appropriate to AT and environmental access involvement of community-based disability organizations. The Resource Center

will also provide AT and environmental access technical assistance to community-based organizations and will foster cooperation among the funded projects. These community-based research projects will broaden the inclusion of persons with disabilities in developing practical and affordable solutions to AT and environmental access problems and needs.

In recent years, a number of NIDRR grant competitions have led to research projects and activities that aim at improving access to AT and reducing environmental barriers. For many years, NIDRR funded grants to States under the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988 (Tech Act). In addition to research programs under title II of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 796) (the Rehabilitation Act), NIDRR now has responsibility for AT programs under the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (AT Act), which replaced the Tech Act. A June 5, 2000 notice (65 FR 35768-35774) for a new Alternative Financing Program under title III of the AT Act identified numerous issues affecting access of people with disabilities to AT. An April 5, 1999 notice (64 FR 16531) under NIDRR's Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center (RERC) program discussed the importance of improving access to the environment through universal design. For information on

ongoing and completed NIDRR-supported activities in these areas, contact the National Rehabilitation Information Center at <http://www.naric.com/> or telephone 1-800-346-2742.

This year, NIDRR anticipates awarding a number of projects related to AT and environmental access. For updates on the status of announcements please see the Education Department Forecast of Funding Opportunities under Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs for FY 2001 at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OCFO/grants/forecast.html>

According to the Rehabilitation Act, the purpose of IL programs is "to promote a philosophy of consumer control, peer support, self-help, self-determination, equal access, and individual empowerment, equal access, and system advocacy, in order to maximize the leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society." The concepts in this philosophy of consumer control, peer support, and self-help place these title VII independent living centers (CILs) within a broader world-wide grouping known as "community-based" organizations.

The term "community-based" organization has varying meanings in disability and rehabilitation programs and in social

research. For the purpose of these two priorities, a "community-based disability organization" is a consumer-directed community organization such as a CIL. Consumer control is the key. Some community rehabilitation service organizations, for example psychosocial rehabilitation programs, also value consumer direction. Other disability-related organizations are located in community settings, but do not have significant consumer direction. Section 7 of the Rehabilitation Act, for example, identifies community rehabilitation programs as providers of AT devices and services for persons with disabilities, but such organizations may or may not be consumer directed. Organizations with consumer direction, including CILs and other organizations such as protection and advocacy (P&A) agencies, are in a unique position to help identify and study the specific needs for AT and environmental access of individuals from diverse populations and therefore are the focus of this research effort.

A number of private foundations and international agencies have identified the value of investing in "grassroots", consumer-directed organizations, particularly in public health and economic development. These organizations aim at reducing poverty or specific diseases such as HIV/AIDS, or they provide assistance to special needs groups such as people in troubled

urban and rural areas (see the World Wide Web sites or publications of the Pew Fund for Health and Human Services <http://www.pewtrusts.com/>, the World Health Organization <http://www.who.int/>, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation <http://www.rwjf.org/index.jsp> for examples).

Community-based research encompasses a broad set of research activities with differing, and sometimes competing, concepts and methods. Sociology, anthropology, community psychology and public health, for example, use applied community research methods. For the purpose of these two proposed priorities, community-based research is intensive, systematic study directed toward new or full scientific knowledge or understanding of AT or environmental access problems. In addition, the research must be completed in the community under the direction of community-based disability organizations (Sclove, R.E, Scammell, M.L. & Holland, B. (1998). Community-based Research in the U.S. Amherst, MA: The Loka Institute (<http://www.loka.org/>)).

Community-based disability and rehabilitation research puts primary emphasis on assisting persons with disabilities by producing and disseminating knowledge and technology and promoting and advancing the rehabilitation and integration process at the community level. Community-based disability and

rehabilitation research, according to these two priorities, applies to the use of, or need for, AT devices and services by persons with disabilities in the community, and related issues of environmental access. Such research should be performed by qualified researchers in cooperation with community-based disability organizations. NIDRR supports the notion that persons with disabilities provide unique perspectives about living with disability and must be included in community-based research projects to the greatest possible extent. Their experience with, and interest in, finding practical solutions to problems encountered in home, school, place of work, and community make them informed participants, if not particularly qualified researchers. To ensure that technology-related problems relevant to persons with disabilities are studied, contributions from such persons are encouraged. In addition, university-based research on disability needs to be complemented by community-based research to provide the community with useful and immediate tools, technologies, and knowledge for overcoming barriers to access and participation in economy and society.

Community-based rehabilitation research is particularly suited for persons with disabilities. According to the University of Washington School of Public Health and Community

Medicine's Principles of Community-Based Research, a research partnership between a university and community-based organizations should accomplish the following:

- Community partners should be involved at the earliest stages of the project, helping to define research objectives and having input into how the project will be organized.

- Community partners should have real influence on project direction--that is, enough leverage to ensure that the original goals, mission, and methods of the project are observed.

- Research processes and outcomes should benefit the community. Community members should be hired and trained whenever possible and appropriate, and the research should help build and enhance community assets.

- Community members should be part of the analysis and interpretation of data and should have input into how the results are distributed. This does not imply censorship of data or of publication, but rather the opportunity to make clear the community's views about the interpretation prior to final publication.

- Productive partnerships between researchers and community members should be encouraged to last beyond the life

of the project. This will make it more likely that research findings will be incorporated into ongoing community programs and therefore provide the greatest possible benefit to the community from research.

- Community members should be empowered to initiate their own research projects that address needs they identify themselves.

Priority 3: Resource Center for Community-based Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects on Technology for Independence

There is a need for capacity-building on conceptual and methodological approaches to research on the involvement of community-based organizations of people with disabilities in promoting technology for independence. There is need for training, technical assistance, and dissemination efforts to guide ongoing efforts. Advice and strategies are needed in specific areas including, but not limited to, research designs and methodologies, case studies, focus group research, AT and environmental assessment, small sample surveys, participant observation, ethnography, and participatory action research. There is a need to develop "how-to-do" materials on disability-related AT and environmental access community-based research, reference resources, web-based access to materials, and other means of communicating knowledge about community-based

rehabilitation research in the U.S.

Priority 3

We will establish a resource center to assist Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects on Technology for Independence and other related NIDRR activities under the Plan with capacity-building for improving the involvement of community-based organizations of people with disabilities in promoting technology for independence.

In carrying out these purposes, the project must:

(a) Establish and conduct a significant and substantial resource program on capacity-building in research, training, and TA on the involvement of community-based disability organizations in promoting technology for access and function that will contribute to the advancement of knowledge in accordance with the Plan.

(b) Disseminate findings from the Resource Center's program on community-based research to DRRPs on Technology for Independence and other related NIDRR-funded activities under the Plan; and

(c) Describe how the resource center will develop research capacity among individuals with disabilities at the community level.

In addition to the activities proposed by the applicant to carry out these purposes, the Resource Center must:

- Involve individuals with disabilities and, if appropriate, their representatives, in planning and implementing the research, training, and dissemination activities, and in evaluating the Center;

- Coordinate with appropriate federally funded projects. Coordination responsibilities will be identified through consultation with the NIDRR project officer and may include outreach to specific NIDRR DRRPs, RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs and AT Projects; Office of Special Education technology projects and Parent Training and Information Centers; and Rehabilitation Services Administration training, special demonstration, and IL projects;

- Convene a formative review session within six months of project award with the DRRPs on Technology for Independence to assist these community-based rehabilitation researchers in the finalization of their research plans, and to help them with the commencement of their research projects; and

- Conduct a state-of-the-science conference, including the DRRPs on Technology for Independence, in the third year of the

grant and publish a comprehensive report on the final outcomes of the conference in the fourth year of the grant.

Priority 4: Community-based Disability and Rehabilitation

Research Projects on Technology for Independence

The Plan identifies disability in terms of the relationship between the individual and the natural, built, cultural, and social environments (63 FR 57189-57219). The Plan focuses on both individual and systemic factors that have an impact on the ability of people to function. The elements of the Plan include employment outcomes, health and function, technology for access and function, and IL and community integration. To attain the goals in these areas, the Plan also includes capacity building for research and training, and to ensure knowledge dissemination and utilization. Each area of the Plan includes objectives at both the individual and system levels. For example, the technology for access and function area of the Plan includes research objectives to develop AT that supports people with disabilities to function and live independently and obtain better employment outcomes, and research objectives to promote improved access to the built environment and concepts of universal design. It is clear that the challenges and opportunities for AT and improved environmental access reflect all of the priority areas of the Plan.

Priority 4

We will establish research projects to involve community-based disability organizations in AT and environmental access research leading to practical and affordable solutions to identified problems and needs, and building research capacity at the community level and in community-based organizations serving persons with disabilities.

In carrying out these purposes, a project must:

(a) From the examples of research objectives below, conduct a significant and substantial research program on the involvement of community-based disability organizations in promoting technology for access and function that will contribute to the advancement of knowledge in accordance with the Plan by:

- Investigating and developing research questions, methodologies, and recommendations for use by other research entities in solving technology-related, engineering, psychosocial, economic and other problems at the individual and systems levels, in the United States (U.S.); and

- Designing and testing models for partnership of community-based disability organizations in research, participant observation studies and other qualitative and quantitative research approaches to using technology in community-based settings;

(b) Disseminate findings from community-based research to persons with disabilities, their representatives, disability and rehabilitation service providers, researchers, planners, and policy makers; and

(c) Describe how the applicant will develop research capacity among individuals with disabilities at the community level.

In carrying out these purposes, the project must:

- Coordinate with appropriate federally funded projects. Coordination responsibilities will be identified through consultation with the NIDRR project officer and may include outreach to specific NIDRR DRPs, RERCs, Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers (RRTC), Disability Business Technical Assistance Centers (DBTACs) and AT Projects; Office of Special Education technology projects and Parent Training and Information Centers; and Rehabilitation Services Administration training, special demonstration, and IL projects.

- Involve individuals with disabilities in key decision-making.

- Participate in a formative review session to be convened by the Resource Center within six months of award, and cooperate with the Resource Center's capacity-building and evaluation activities.

- Participate in a state-of-the-science conference in the third year of the grant.

SELECTION CRITERIA: The selection criteria to be used for these competitions will be provided in the application package for each competition.

Applicable Program Regulations: 34 CFR part 350.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site:

www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC, area at (202) 512-1530.

Note: The official version of the document is published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at:

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers 84.133A,
Disability Rehabilitation Research Project)

Program Authority: 29 U.S.C. 762(g) and 764(b).

Dated: June 26, 2001

Signed

Francis V. Corrigan,
Deputy Director
National Institute on
Disability and Rehabilitation
Research.

SECTION C

4000-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(CFDA No.: 84.133A)

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

ACTION: Notice inviting applications for fiscal year (FY) 2001
new awards and announcement of pre-application meetings

SUMMARY: We invite applications for new FY 2001 grant awards
for four Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and
Centers Program (DRRP) on: (1) Assistive Technology Outcomes and
Impacts, (2) Assistive Technology Research Projects for
Individuals with Cognitive Disabilities, (3) Resource Center for
Community-based Research on Technology for Independence, and (4)
Community-based Research Projects on Technology for
Independence.

PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM: The purpose of the Disability and
Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program is to
improve the effectiveness of services authorized under the
Rehabilitation Act of 1973. We take this action to focus
research attention on an area of national need. The priorities
are intended to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes for
individuals with disabilities.

National Education Goals

The eight National Education Goals focus the Nation's education reform efforts and provide a framework for improving teaching and learning.

This notice addresses the National Education Goal that every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), 34 CFR Part 74, 75, 77, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86 and 97; and the following program regulations: Disability Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers -- 34 CFR part 350, and the Notice of Final Priority published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING: Interested parties are invited to participate in pre-application meetings to discuss the funding priorities. In each meeting you will receive technical assistance and information about the funding priority. You may attend the meetings either in person or by conference call at the Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Switzer Building, Room 3065, 330 C St. S.W., Washington, DC between 10:00 a.m. and 12 noon. NIDRR staff will also be available at this location from 1:30 p.m. to 4:00

p.m. on that same day to provide technical assistance through individual consultation about the funding priority.

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING DATES: The pre-application meeting for **BOTH** the **Resource Center for Community-based Research on Technology for Independence and Community-based Research Projects on Technology for Independence** priorities will be held on **July 11, 2001**. For further information or to make arrangements to attend the July 11, 2001 meeting contact Dawn Carlson, Switzer Building, room 3421, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202. Internet: Dawn.Carlson@ed.gov Telephone (202) 401-2068. If you use a telecommunication device for the deaf (TDD), you may call (202) 205-4475.

The pre-application meeting for the **Assistive Technology Outcomes and Impacts** priority will be held on **July 17, 2001**. For further information or to make arrangements to attend the July 17, 2001 meeting contact Donna Nangle, Switzer Building, room 3414, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202. Internet: Donna.Nangle@ed.gov Telephone (202) 205-5880. If you use a telecommunication device for the deaf (TDD), you may call (202) 205-4475.

The pre-application meeting for the **Assistive Technology Research Projects for Individuals with Cognitive Disabilities** priority will be held on **July 18, 2001**. For further information

or to make arrangements to attend the July 18, 2001 meeting contact Roseann Rafferty, Switzer Building, room 3428, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202. Internet: Roseann.Rafferty@ed.gov Telephone (202) 205-5867. If you use a telecommunication device for the deaf (TDD), you may call (202) 205-4475.

Assistance to Individuals With Disabilities at the Public Meetings

The meeting site is accessible to individuals with disabilities, and a sign language interpreter will be available. If you need an auxiliary aid or service other than a sign language interpreter in order to participate in the meeting (e.g., other interpreting service such as oral, cued speech, or tactile interpreter; assistive listening device; or materials in alternative format), notify the contact person listed in this notice at least two weeks before the scheduled meeting date. Although we will attempt to meet a request we receive after this date, we may not be able to make available the requested auxiliary aid or service because of insufficient time to arrange it.

Application Notice for Fiscal Year 2001
Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects, CFDA No. 84-133A

Funding Priority	Deadline for transmittal of applications	Estimated number of awards	Maximum award amount (per year)*	Project period (months)
84.133A-4, Assistive Technology Outcomes and Impacts	15 August 2001	2	\$450,000	60
84.133A-6, Assistive Technology Research Projects for Individuals with Cognitive Disabilities	15 August 2001	3	\$300,000	60
84.133A-5, Resource Center for Community-based Research on Technology for Independence	15 August 2001	1	\$300,000	60
84.133A-7, Community-based Research Projects on Technology for Independence	15 August 2001	3	\$300,000	60

*Note: The Secretary will reject without consideration or evaluation any application that proposes a project funding level that exceeds the stated maximum award amount in any year (See 34 CFR 75.104(b)).

NOTE: The estimate of funding level and awards in this notice do not bind the Department of Education to a specific level of funding or number of grants.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Parties eligible to apply for grants under this program are States, public or private agencies, including for-profit agencies, public or private organizations, including for-profit organizations, institutions of higher education, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations.

SELECTION CRITERIA: The selection criteria to be used for these competitions will be provided in the application package for each competition.

FOR APPLICATIONS CONTACT: Education Publications Center (ED Pubs), P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794-1398. Telephone (toll free): 1-877-433-7827. FAX: (301) 470-1244. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call (toll free): 1-877-576-7734.

You may also contact ED Pubs via its Web site:
<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html> or its E-mail address
(edpubs@inet.ed.gov). If you request an application from ED Pubs, be sure to identify this competition as follows: CFDA number 84.133A.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain a copy of the application package in an alternative format by contacting the Grants and Contracts Services Team, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., room 3317, Switzer

C-6

Building, Washington, DC 20202-2550. Telephone: (202) 205-8351. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Information Relay Services (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

However, the Department is not able to reproduce in an alternative format the standard forms included in the application package.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donna Nangle, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., room 3414, Switzer Building, Washington, DC

20202-2645. Telephone: (202) 205-5880. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the TDD number at (202) 205-4475. Internet: Donna.Nangle@ed.gov

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may review this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site:

C-7

www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC/, area at (202) 512-1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO access at:

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>

PROGRAM AUTHORITY: 29 U.S.C. 762(g) and 764(b).

Dated: June 26, 2001

signed

Francis V. Corrigan,
Deputy Director
National Institute on
Disability and Rehabilitation
Research.

SECTION D

We use the following selection criteria to evaluate applications for the **Resource Center for Community-based on Technology for Independence**.

(a) **Importance of the problem** (4 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the importance of the problem.

(2) In determining the importance of the problem, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant proposes to provide training in a rehabilitation discipline or area of study in which there is a shortage of qualified researchers, or to a trainee population in which there is a need for more qualified researchers (2 point).

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project will have beneficial impact on the target population (2 point).

(b) **Responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority** (7 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority.

(1) In determining the responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority, the Secretary considers the following factors:

D-1

(i) The extent to which the applicant addresses all requirements of the absolute priority (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the applicant's proposed activities are likely to achieve the purposes of the absolute or competitive priority (4 points).

(c) **Design of training activities** (17 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of training activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the training materials are likely to be effective, including consideration of their quality, clarity, and variety (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the proposed training content (3 points).

(iii) The extent to which the proposed training materials and methods are accessible to individuals with disabilities (3 points).

(iv) The extent to which the applicant is able to carry out the training activities, either directly or through another entity (3 points).

D-2

(v) The extent to which the opportunities for collegial and collaborative activities, exposure to outstanding scientists in the field, and opportunities to participate in the preparation of scholarly or scientific publications and presentations are extensive and appropriate (5 points).

(d) **Design of dissemination activities** (10 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of dissemination activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the content of the information to be disseminated --

(A) Covers all of the relevant aspects of the subject matter (1 point);
and

(B) If appropriate, is based on new knowledge derived from research aspects of the project (1 point).

(ii) The extent to which the materials to be disseminated are likely to be effective and usable, including consideration of their quality, clarity, variety, and format (2 points).

D-3

(iii) The extent to which the methods for dissemination are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration (2 points).

(iv) The extent to which the materials and information to be disseminated and the methods for dissemination are appropriate to the target population, including consideration of the familiarity of the target population with the subject matter, format of the information, and subject matter (2 points).

(v) The extent to which the information to be disseminated will be accessible to individuals with disabilities (2 points).

(e) Design of utilization activities (6 points total)

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of utilization activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the potential of new users of the information or technology have a practical use for the information and are likely to adopt the practices or use the information or technology, including new devices (2 points)

D-4

(ii) The extent to which the utilization strategies are likely to be effective (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the information or technology is likely to be of use in other settings (2 points).

(f) **Design of technical assistance activities** (15 points)

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the methods for providing technical assistance activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods for providing technical assistance are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the information to be provided through technical assistance covers all of the relevant aspects of the subject matter (4 points).

(iii) The extent to which the technical assistance is appropriate to the target population, including consideration of the knowledge level of the target population, needs of the target population, and format for providing information (4 points).

D-5

(iv) The extent to which the technical assistance is accessible to individuals with disabilities (4 points).

(g) **Plan of operation** (4 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of operation.

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of operation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of the plan of operation to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, and timelines for accomplishing project tasks (2 points).

(ii) The adequacy of the plan of operation to provide for using resources, equipment, and personnel to achieve each objective (2 points).

(h) **Collaboration** (9 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the quality of collaboration.

(2) In determining the quality of collaboration, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration with one or more agencies, organizations, or institutions is likely to be effective in achieving the relevant proposed activities of the project (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which agencies, organizations, or institutions demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with the applicant (3 points).

D-6

(iii) The extent to which agencies, organizations, or institutions that commit to collaborate with the applicant have the capacity to carry out collaborative activities (3 points).

(i) **Adequacy and reasonableness of the budget** (3 points total). (1)

The Secretary considers the adequacy and the reasonableness of the proposed budget.

(2) In determining the adequacy and the reasonableness of the proposed budget, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the proposed project activities (1 point).

(ii) The extent to which the budget for the project, including any subcontracts, is adequately justified to support the proposed project activities (1 point).

(iii) The extent to which the applicant is of sufficient size, scope, and quality to effectively carry out the activities in a efficient manner (1 point).

(j) **Plan of evaluation** (6 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of evaluation.

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(h) The extent to which the plan of evaluation provides for periodic assessment of progress toward--

D-7

(A) Implementing the plan of operation (1 point); and

(B) Achieving the project's intended outcomes and expected impacts (1 point).

(ii) The extent to which the plan of evaluation will be used to improve the performance of the project through the feedback generated by its periodic assessments (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the plan of evaluation provides for periodic assessment of a project's progress that is based on identified performance measures that--

(A) Are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and expected impacts on the target population (1 point); and

(B) Are objective, and quantifiable or qualitative, as appropriate (1 point).

(k) **Project staff** (15 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the project staff.

(2) In determining the quality of the project staff, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

D-8

(i) The extent to which the key personnel and other key staff have appropriate training and experience in disciplines

required to conduct all proposed activities (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the commitment of staff time is adequate to accomplish all the proposed activities of the project (3 points).

(iii) The extent to which the key personnel are knowledgeable about the methodology and literature of pertinent subject areas (3 points).

(iv) The extent to which the project staff includes outstanding scientists in the field (3 points).

(v) The extent to which key personnel have up-to-date knowledge from research or effective practice in the subject area covered in the priority (3 points).

(1) **Adequacy and accessibility of resources.** (4 points) (1) The Secretary considers the adequacy and accessibility of resources.

(2) In determining the quality of the the adequacy and accessibility of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant is committed to provide adequate facilities, equipment, other resources, including administrative support, and laboratories, if appropriate (1 point). D-9

(ii) The quality of an applicant's past performance in carrying out a grant (1 point).

(iii) The extent to which the applicant has appropriate access to clinical populations and organizations representing individuals with disabilities to support advanced clinical rehabilitation research (1 point).

(iv) The extent to which the facilities, equipment, and other resources are appropriately accessible to individuals with disabilities who may use the facilities, equipment, and other resources of the project (1 point).

D-10

SECTION F

We use the following selection criteria to evaluate applications for **Community-based Research Projects on Technology for Independence**.

(a) **Importance of the problem** (6 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the importance of the problem.

(2) In determining the importance of the problem, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant clearly describes the need and target population (1 point).

(ii) The extent to which the proposed activities further the purposes of the Act (1 point).

(iii) The extent to which the proposed activities address a significant need of one or more disabled populations (1 point).

(iv) The extent to which the proposed activities address a significant need of those who provide services to individuals with disabilities (1 point).

(v) The extent to which the applicant proposes to provide training in a rehabilitation discipline or area of study in which there is a shortage of qualified researchers, or to a trainee population in which there is a need for more qualified researchers (1 points).

E-1

(vi) The extent to which the proposed project will have beneficial impact on the target population (1 point).

(b) **Responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority** (4 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority.

(2) In determining the responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant addresses all requirements of the absolute priority (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the applicant's proposed activities are likely to achieve the purposes of the absolute or competitive priority (2 points).

(c) **Design of research activities** (20 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of research activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the research activities constitute a coherent, sustained approach to research in the field, including a substantial addition to the state-of-the-art (5 points).

E-2

(ii) The extent to which the methodology of each proposed research activity is meritorious, including consideration of the extent to which—

(A) The proposed design includes a comprehensive and informed review of the current literature, demonstrating knowledge of the state-of-the-art (2 points);

(B) Each research hypothesis is theoretically sound and based on current knowledge (2 points);

(C) Each sample population is appropriate and of sufficient size (2 points);

(D) The data collection and measurement techniques are appropriate and likely to be effective (2 points); and

(E) The data analysis methods are appropriate (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which anticipated research results are likely to satisfy the original hypotheses and could be used for planning additional research, including generation of new hypotheses where applicable (5 points).

(d) **Design of dissemination activities** (15 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of dissemination activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project,

E-3

the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the content of the information to be disseminated -

(A) Covers all of the relevant subject matter (2 point); and

(B) If appropriate, is based on new knowledge derived from research activities of the project (1 point).

(ii) The extent to which the materials to be disseminated are likely to be effective and usable, including consideration of their quality, clarity, variety, and format (3 points).

(iii) The extent to which the methods for dissemination are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration (3 points)

(iv) The extent to which the materials and information to be disseminated and the methods for dissemination are appropriate to the target population, including consideration of the familiarity of the target population with the subject matter, format of the information, and subject matter (3 points).

(v) The extent to which the information to be disseminated will be accessible to individuals with disabilities (3 points).

E-4

(e) **Design of technical assistance activities** (10 points) (1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the methods for providing technical assistance activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods for providing technical assistance are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the information to be provided through technical assistance covers all of the relevant aspects of the subject matter (3 points).

(iii) The extent to which the technical assistance is appropriate to the target population, including consideration of the knowledge level of the target population, needs of the target population, and format for providing information (3 points).

(iv) The extent to which the technical assistance is accessible to individuals with disabilities (2 points).

(f) **Plan of operation** (6 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of operation.

E-5

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of operation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of the plan of operation to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, and timelines for accomplishing project tasks (3 points).

(ii) The adequacy of the plan of operation to provide for using resources, equipment, and personnel to achieve each objective (3 points).

(g) **Collaboration** (15 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the quality of collaboration.

(2) In determining the quality of collaboration, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration with one or more agencies, organizations, or institutions is likely to be effective in achieving the relevant proposed activities of the project (5 points).

(ii) The extent to which agencies, organizations, or institutions demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with the applicant (5 points).

(iii) The extent to which agencies, organizations, or institutions that commit to collaborate with the applicant have the capacity to carry out collaborative activities (5 points).

E-6

(h) **Adequacy and reasonableness of the budget** (3 points total). (1)

The Secretary considers the adequacy and the reasonableness of the proposed budget.

(2) In determining the adequacy and the reasonableness of the proposed budget, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the proposed project activities (1 point).

(ii) The extent to which the budget for the project, including any subcontracts, is adequately justified to support the proposed project activities (1 point).

(iii) The extent to which the applicant is of sufficient size, scope, and quality to effectively carry out the activities in a efficient manner (1 point).

(i) **Plan of evaluation** (6 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of evaluation.

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the plan of evaluation provides for periodic assessment of progress toward--

(A) Implementing the plan of operation (1 point); and

(B) Achieving the project's intended outcomes and expected impacts (1 point).

E-7

(ii) The extent to which the plan of evaluation will be used to improve the performance of the project through the feedback generated by its periodic assessments (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the plan of evaluation provides for periodic assessment of a project's progress that is based on identified performance measures that--

(A) Are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and expected impacts on the target population (1 point); and

(B) Are objective, and quantifiable or qualitative, as appropriate (1 point).

(j) **Project staff** (9 points total). (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the project staff.

(2) In determining the quality of the project staff, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the key personnel and other key staff have appropriate training and experience in disciplines required to conduct all proposed activities (3 points).

E-8

(ii) The extent to which the commitment of staff time is adequate to accomplish all the proposed activities of the project (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the key personnel are knowledgeable about the methodology and literature of pertinent subject areas (2 points).

(iv) The extent to which key personnel have up-to-date knowledge from research or effective practice in the subject area covered in the priority (2 points).

(k) **Adequacy and accessibility of resources.** (6 points) (1) The

Secretary considers the adequacy and accessibility of resources.

(2) In determining the quality of the the adequacy and accessibility of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant is committed to provide adequate facilities, equipment, other resources, including administrative support, and laboratories, if appropriate (2 point).

(ii) The extent to which the applicant has appropriate access to clinical populations and organizations representing individuals with disabilities to support advanced clinical rehabilitation research (2 point).

E-9

(iii) The extent to which the facilities, equipment, and other resources are appropriately accessible to individuals with disabilities who may use the facilities, equipment, and other resources of the project (2 points).

E-10

SECTION F

ADDITIONAL SELECTION CRITERION FOR BOTH PRIORITIES

We will use the selection criteria in 34 CFR 350.54 to evaluate applications under this program. The maximum score for all the criteria is 100 points; however, we also propose to use the following criterion so that up to an additional ten points may be earned by an applicant for a total possible score of 110 points:

Within this absolute priority, we will give the following competitive preference to applications that are otherwise eligible for funding under this priority:

Up to ten (10) points is based on the extent to which an application includes effective strategies for employing and advancing in employment qualified individuals with disabilities in projects awarded under this absolute priority. In determining the effectiveness of those strategies, we will consider the applicant's success, as described in the application, in employing and advancing in employment qualified individuals with disabilities in the project.

For purposes of this competitive preference, applicants can be awarded up to a total of 10 points in addition to those awarded under the published selection criteria for this priority. That is, an applicant meeting this competitive preference could earn a maximum total of 110 points.

SECTION G

FREQUENT QUESTIONS

1. CAN I GET AN EXTENSION OF THE DUE DATE?

No. On rare occasions the Department of Education may extend a closing date for all applicants. If that occurs, a notice of the revised due date is published in the Federal Register. However, there are no extensions or exceptions to the due date made for individual applicants.

2. WHAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE APPLICATION?

The application should include a project narrative responding to the priority and selection criteria, vitae of key personnel, and a budget, as well as the Assurances forms included in this package. Vitae of staff or consultants should include the individual's title and role in the proposed project, and other information that is specifically pertinent to this proposed project. The budgets for both the first year and all subsequent project years should be included. If collaboration with another organization is involved in the proposed activity, the application should include assurances of participation by the other parties, including written agreements or assurances of cooperation. It is not useful to include general letters of support or endorsement in the application. If the applicant proposes to use unique tests or other measurement instruments that are not widely known in the field, it would be helpful to include the instrument in the application. Many applications contain voluminous appendices that are not helpful and in many cases cannot even be mailed to the reviewers. It is generally not helpful to include such things as brochures, general capability statements of collaborating organizations, maps, copies of publications, or descriptions of other projects completed by the applicant.

3. WHAT FORMAT SHOULD BE USED FOR THE APPLICATION?

NIDRR generally advises applicants that they may organize the application to follow the selection criteria that will be used. The specific review criteria vary according to the specific program, and are contained in this Consolidated Application Package.

4. MAY I SUBMIT APPLICATIONS TO MORE THAN ONE NIDRR PROGRAM COMPETITION OR MORE THAN ONE APPLICATION TO A PROGRAM?

Yes, you may submit applications to any program for which they are responsive to the program requirements. You may submit the same application to as many competitions as you believe appropriate. You may also submit more than one application in any given competition.

5. WHAT IS THE ALLOWABLE INDIRECT COST RATE?

The limits on indirect costs vary according to the program and the type of application. The DRRPs should limit indirect charges to the organization's approved rate. If the organization does not have an approved rate, the application should include an estimated actual rate.

G-1

6. CAN PROFITMAKING BUSINESSES APPLY FOR GRANTS?

Yes. However, for-profit organizations will not be able to collect a fee or profit on the grant, and in some programs will be required to share in the costs of the project.

7. CAN INDIVIDUALS APPLY FOR GRANTS?

No. Only organizations are eligible to apply for grants under NIDRR programs. However, individuals are the only entities eligible to apply for the fellowships program (84.133F).

8. CAN NIDRR STAFF ADVISE ME WHETHER MY PROJECT IS OF INTEREST TO NIDRR OR LIKELY TO BE FUNDED?

No. NIDRR staff can advise you of the requirements of the program in which you propose to submit your application. However, staff cannot advise you of whether your subject area or proposed approach is likely to receive approval.

9. HOW SOON AFTER SUBMITTING MY APPLICATION CAN I FIND OUT IF IT WILL BE FUNDED?

The time from closing date to grant award date varies from program to program. Generally speaking, NIDRR endeavors to have awards made within five to six months of the closing date. Unsuccessful applicants generally will be notified within that time frame as well. For the purpose of estimating a project start date, the applicant should estimate approximately six months from the closing date, but no later than September 30.

10. CAN I CALL NIDRR TO FIND OUT IF MY APPLICATION IS BEING FUNDED?

No. When NIDRR is able to release information on the status of grant applications, it will notify applicants by letter. The results of the peer review cannot be released except through this formal notification.

11. IF MY APPLICATION IS SUCCESSFUL, CAN I ASSUME I WILL GET THE REQUESTED BUDGET AMOUNT IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS?

No. Funding in subsequent years is subject to availability of funds and project performance.

12. WILL ALL APPROVED APPLICATIONS BE FUNDED?

No. It often happens that the peer review panels approve for funding more applications than NIDRR can fund within available resources. Applicants who are approved but not funded are encouraged to consider submitting similar applications in future competitions.

G-2

POINTS TO REMEMBER IN APPLICATION PREPARATION

1. In the title block of #4 on the 424 form, please note the priority that you are responding to.
2. Please note that the specific selection criteria for each priority are listed in Sections D & E of this package. Remember that different criteria is being used for each priority. Please remember to address the 10 additional selection criteria points.
3. Number all pages to make it easier for the reader to refer to a page number if comments are given (including the appendices).
4. Budget Information: For multi-year projects to provide detailed budget information for the total grant period requested. By requesting detailed budget information in the initial application for the total project period, the need for formal non-competing continuation applications in the remaining years will be eliminated. A performance report that will be required annually will be used in place of the continuation application to determine progress.

Definitions for the most inquired budget categories:

Dollar Amount – Total dollar amount is direct cost plus indirect costs. Remember your application will not be reviewed if you exceed the maximum amount in any year. It is advisable to double check your dollar amount on the ED 424 form, the ED 524 budget form and your budget justification.

Equipment - Tangible, non-expendable personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. However, consistent with institutional policy, lower limits may be established.

Supplies - Direct materials and supplies that are consumable, expendable and of a relatively low unit cost.

Key Personnel - The personnel category of the budget includes **all** project staff members who are employees of the applicant. However, **KEY PERSONNEL** are defined as the Project Director, Principle Investigator, and Project Coordinator.

Other - Where applicants may place all direct costs that are not clearly covered by the other direct cost categories. It is a catch-all category that could include a wide variety of costs that do not seem to "fit" elsewhere in the budget.

G-3

5. Organize your narrative in accordance with the selection criterion in Sections D & E of this package. Address all criteria.
6. Include a table of contents in your application.
7. Try to keep the narrative to 75 pages, double-spaced. The one-page abstract may be single-spaced.
8. Application must be postmarked by the closing date of **15 April 2002**. If sending by courier service (i.e., Fed X, UPS, Postal Express), please hand deliver between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., to the following address: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Room 3633, General Services Administration National Capital Region, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-4725. Please be sure it indicate the appropriate priority title along with the CFDA 84.133A in the ATTN: line.
9. Remember to include a narrative on the protection of Human Subjects as it pertains to your grant if you check "yes" on block number 12 of the 424 form. If you check "no" please include a paragraph of why it is not required.

G-4

SECTION H

Application Transmittal Instructions

An application for an award must be postmarked or hand delivered by the closing date.

Applications Sent by Regular Mail

An application sent by mail must be addressed to the U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: CFDA 84.133A, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Washington, DC 20202-4725.

An application must show proof of mailing consisting of one of the following:

- (1) A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service Postmark.
- (2) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service.
- (3) A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.
- (4) Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

If an application is sent through the U.S. Postal Service, the Secretary does not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:

- (1) A private metered postmark, or
- (2) A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.

An applicant should note that the U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, an applicant should check with its local post office.

An applicant is encouraged to use registered or at least first class mail.

Each late applicant will be notified that its application will not be considered.

Application Delivered by Hand/Carrier Service

An application that is hand delivered must be taken to the U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, ATTENTION CFDA 84.133A, Room 3633, Regional Office Building #3, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-4725.

The Application Control Center will accept deliveries between 8:00 a.m., and 4:30 p.m. (Washington, D.C.) daily, except Saturdays, Sundays and Federal holidays.

Individuals delivering applications must use the D Street entrance. Proper identification is necessary to enter the building.

In order for an application sent through a Courier Service to be considered timely, the Courier Service must be in receipt of the application on or before the closing date.

SECTION I

INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICATION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICATION NARRATIVE

Part I – See Forms Section.

Part II – Budget Information

Part III - Application Narrative

We strongly recommend the following:

- (a) A one-page abstract;
- (b) An application narrative (i.e., Section D that addresses the selection criteria that will be used by reviewers in evaluating individual proposals) of no more than 75 pages double-spaced (no more than 3 lines per vertical inch) 8.5 x 11" pages (on one side only) with one inch margins (top, bottom, and sides).
- (c) A font no smaller than a 12-point font and an average character density no greater than 14 characters per inch.

The recommended application narrative page limit does not apply to: (a) the forms – Application for Federal Education Assistance (ED 424), Assurances – Non-Construction Programs (SF 424B and the Certifications (ED 80-0013), and SF LLL; (b) the one-page abstract; (c) the budget section (including the narrative budget justification); and (d) information on protection of human subjects .

The recommendations for double-spacing and font do not apply within charts, tables, figures, and graphs, but the information presented in those formats should be easily readable.

Part IV – See Forms Section

APPLICATION FORMS

The enclosed forms shall be used by all applicants for Federal Assistance under all NIDRR programs. A separate application must be submitted for each grant sought. No grant may be awarded unless the completed application forms have been received. If an item does not appear to be relevant to the assistance requested, write "NA" for not applicable.

This application consists of four parts. These parts are organized in the same manner that the submitted application should be organized. These parts are as follows:

Part I - Federal Assistance Application Face Page

Part II - Budget Information

Part III - Application Narrative

Part IV - Assurances, Certifications and Disclosures

Each submitted application should include an index or table of contents and a one-page project abstract. Pages should be consecutively numbered.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1820-0027. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 40 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

Under terms of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, as amended, and the regulations implementing that Act, the Department of Education invites comment on the public reporting burden in this collection of information. You may send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1820-0027, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Application for Federal Education Assistance (ED 424)



U.S. Department of Education

Form Approved
OMB No. 1875-0106
Exp. 11/30/2004

Applicant Information

1. Name and Address

Legal Name: _____

Address: _____

City

State

County

ZIP Code + 4

2. Applicant's D-U-N-S Number |____| |____| |____| |____| |____| |____| |____| |____|

3. Applicant's T-I-N |____| |____| - |____| |____| |____| |____| |____| |____|

4. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance #: **84.** |____| |____| |____| |____|

Title: _____

5. Project Director: _____

Address: _____

City State Zip code + 4

Tel. #: () _____ - _____ Fax #: () _____ - _____

E-Mail Address: _____

Organizational Unit

6. Novice Applicant ___ Yes ___ No

7. Is the applicant delinquent on any Federal debt? ___ Yes ___ No

8. Type of Applicant (Enter appropriate letter in the box.) |____|

A - State F - Independent School District
B - Local G - Public College or University
C - Special District H - Private, Non-profit College or University
D - Indian Tribe I - Non-profit Organization
E - Individual J - Private, Profit-Making Organization

K - Other (Specify): _____

Application Information

9. Type of Submission:

-PreApplication -Application
___ Construction ___ Construction
___ Non-Construction ___ Non-Construction

10. Is application subject to review by Executive Order 12372 process?

___ Yes (Date made available to the Executive Order 12372
process for review): ____/____/____

___ No (If "No," check appropriate box below.)

___ Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

___ Program has not been selected by State for review.

12. Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed project period?

___ Yes (Go to 12a.) ___ No (Go to item 13.)

12a. Are all the research activities proposed designated to be exempt from the regulations?

___ Yes (Provide Exemption(s) #): _____

___ No (Provide Assurance #, if available): _____

13. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:

11. Proposed Project Dates: ____/____/____

Start Date:

End Date:

Estimated Funding

14a. Federal \$ _____ . 00

b. Applicant \$ _____ . 00

c. State \$ _____ . 00

d. Local \$ _____ . 00

e. Other \$ _____ . 00

f. Program Income \$ _____ . 00

g. TOTAL \$ _____ . 00

Authorized Representative Information

15. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this preapplication/application are true

and correct. The document has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant

and the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if the assistance is awarded.

a. Authorized Representative (Please type or print name clearly.)

b. Title: _____

c. Tel. #: () _____ - _____ Fax #: () _____ - _____

d. E-Mail Address: _____

e. Signature of Authorized Representative

_____ Date: ____/____/____

Instructions for Form ED 424

- 1. Legal Name and Address.** Enter the legal name of applicant and the name of the primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity.
- 2. D-U-N-S Number.** Enter the applicant's D-U-N-S Number. If your organization does not have a D-U-N-S Number, you can obtain the number by calling 1-800-333-0505 or by completing a D-U-N-S Number Request Form. The form can be obtained via the Internet at the following URL: <http://www.dnb.com>.
- 3. Tax Identification Number.** Enter the taxpayer's identification number as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.
- 4. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number.** Enter the CFDA number and title of the program under which assistance is requested. The CFDA number can be found in the federal register notice and the application package.
- 5. Project Director.** Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address of the person to be contacted on matters involving this application.
- 6. Novice Applicant.** Check "Yes" or "No" only if assistance is being requested under a program that gives special consideration to novice applicants. Otherwise, **leave blank**.

Check "Yes" if you meet the requirements for novice applicants specified in the regulations in 34 CFR 75.225 and included on the attached page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424." By checking "Yes" the applicant certifies that it meets these novice applicant requirements. Check "No" if you do not meet the requirements for novice applicants.
- 7. Federal Debt Delinquency.** Check "Yes" if the applicant's organization is delinquent on any Federal debt. (This question refers to the applicant's organization and not to the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes.) Otherwise, check "No."
- 8. Type of Applicant.** Enter the appropriate letter in the box provided.
- 9. Type of Submission.** See "Definitions for Form ED 424" attached.
- 10. Executive Order 12372.** See "Definitions for Form ED 424" attached. Check "Yes" if the application is subject to review by E.O. 12372. Also, please enter the month, day, and four (4) digit year (e.g., 12/12/2001). Otherwise, check "No."
- 11. Proposed Project Dates.** Please enter the month, day, and four (4) digit year (e.g., 12/12/2001).
- 12. Human Subjects Research.** (See I.A. "Definitions" in attached page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424.")

If Not Human Subjects Research. Check "No" if research activities involving human subjects are not planned at any time during the proposed project period. The remaining parts of Item 12 are then not applicable.

If Human Subjects Research. Check "Yes" if research activities involving human subjects are planned at any time during the proposed project period, either at the applicant organization or at any other performance site or collaborating institution. Check "Yes" even if the research is exempt from the regulations for the protection of human subjects. (See I.B. "Exemptions" in attached page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424.")

12a. If Human Subjects Research is Exempt from the Human Subjects Regulations. Check "Yes" if all the research activities proposed are designated to be exempt from the regulations. Insert the exemption number(s) corresponding to one or more of the six exemption categories listed in I.B. "Exemptions." In addition, follow the instructions in II.A. "Exempt Research Narrative" in the attached page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424." Insert this narrative immediately following the ED 424 face page.

12a. If Human Subjects Research is Not Exempt from Human Subjects Regulations. Check "No" if some or all of the planned research activities are covered (not exempt), and provide the assurance number if available. In addition, follow the instructions in II.B. "Nonexempt Research Narrative" in the page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424." Insert this narrative immediately following the ED 424 face page.

12a. Human Subjects Assurance Number. If the applicant has an approved Federal Wide (FWA) or Multiple Project Assurance (MPA) with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, that covers the specific activity, insert the number in the space provided. If the applicant does not have an approved assurance on file with OHRP, enter "None" in item 12b. In this case, the applicant, by signature on the face page, is declaring that it will comply with 34 CFR 97 and proceed to obtain the human subjects assurance upon request by the designated ED official. If the application is recommended/selected for funding, the designated ED official will request that the applicant obtain the assurance within 30 days after the specific formal request.

Note about Institutional Review Board Approval. ED does not require certification of Institutional Review Board approval with the application. However, if an application that involves non-exempt human subjects research is recommended/selected for funding, the designated ED official will request that the applicant obtain and send the certification to ED within 30 days after the formal request.

13. Project Title. Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real property projects), attach a map showing

project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project.

14. Estimated Funding. Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate **only** the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 14.

15. Certification. To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. Be sure to enter the telephone and fax number and e-mail address of the authorized representative. Also, in item 15e, please enter the month, day, and four (4) digit year (e.g., 12/12/2001) in the date signed field.

Paperwork Burden Statement. **According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1875-0106. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average between 15 and 45 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection.** If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: **U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651.** If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form write directly to: **Joyce I. Mays, Application Control Center, U.S. Department of Education, 7th and D Streets, S.W. ROB-3, Room 3633, Washington, D.C. 20202-4725**

Definitions for Form ED 424

Novice Applicant (See 34 CFR 75.225). For discretionary grant programs under which the Secretary gives special consideration to novice applications, a novice applicant means any applicant for a grant from ED that—

- Has never received a grant or subgrant under the program from which it seeks funding;
- Has never been a member of a group application, submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, that received a grant under the program from which it seeks funding; and
- Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program. For the purposes of this requirement, a grant is active until the end of the grant's project or funding period, including any extensions of those periods that extend the grantee's authority to obligate funds.

In the case of a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, a group includes only parties that meet the requirements listed above.

Type of Submission. “Construction” includes construction of new buildings and acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings, or any combination of such activities (including architects' fees and the cost of acquisition of land). “Construction” also includes remodeling to meet standards, remodeling designed to conserve energy, renovation or remodeling to accommodate new technologies, and the purchase of existing historic buildings for conversion to public libraries. For the purposes of this paragraph, the term “equipment” includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them; and such term includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of library services.

Executive Order 12372. The purpose of Executive Order 12372 is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and strengthen federalism by relying on State and local processes for the coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance and direct Federal development. The application notice, as published in the Federal Register, informs the applicant as to whether the program is subject to the requirements of E.O. 12372. In addition, the application package contains information on the State Single Point of Contact. An applicant is still eligible to apply for a grant or grants even if its respective State, Territory, Commonwealth, etc. does not have a State Single Point of Contact. For additional information on E.O. 12372 go to <http://www.cfda.gov/public/eo12372.htm>.

PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH

I. Definitions and Exemptions

A. Definitions.

A research activity involves human subjects if the activity is research, as defined in the Department's regulations, and the research activity will involve use of human subjects, as defined in the regulations.

—Research

The ED Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects, Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 97, define research as “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.” *If an activity follows a deliberate plan whose purpose is to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge it is research.* Activities which meet this definition constitute research whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities.

—Human Subject

The regulations define human subject as “a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains (1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or (2) identifiable private information.” *(1) If an activity involves obtaining information about a living person by manipulating that person or that*

person's environment, as might occur when a new instructional technique is tested, or by communicating or interacting with the individual, as occurs with surveys and interviews, the definition of human subject is met. (2) If an activity involves obtaining private information about a living person in such a way that the information can be linked to that individual (the identity of the subject is or may be readily determined by the investigator or associated with the information), the definition of human subject is met. [Private information includes information about behavior that occurs in a context in which an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or recording is taking place, and information which has been provided for specific purposes by an individual and which the individual can reasonably expect will not be made public (for example, a school health record).]

B. Exemptions.

Research activities in which the **only** involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following six categories of **exemptions** are not covered by the regulations:

(1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (a) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (b) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation. ***If the subjects are children, exemption 2 applies only to research involving educational tests and observations of public behavior when the investigator(s) do not participate in the activities being observed. Exemption 2 does not apply if children are surveyed or interviewed or if the research involves observation of public behavior and the investigator(s) participate in the activities being observed.*** [Children are defined as persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law or jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted.]

(3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under section (2) above, if the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

(5) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (a) public benefit or service programs; (b) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (c) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (d) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

(6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (a) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (b) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

II. Instructions for Exempt and Nonexempt Human Subjects Research

Narratives

If the applicant marked “Yes” for Item 12 on the ED 424, the applicant must provide a human subjects “exempt research” or “nonexempt research” narrative and insert it immediately following the ED 424 face page.

A. Exempt Research Narrative.

If you marked “Yes” for item 12 a. and designated exemption numbers(s), provide the “exempt research” narrative. The narrative must contain sufficient information about the involvement of human subjects in the proposed research to allow a determination by ED that the designated exemption(s) are appropriate. The narrative must be succinct.

B. Nonexempt Research Narrative.

If you marked “No” for item 12 a. you must provide the “nonexempt research” narrative. The narrative must address the follow

PART II - BUDGET INFORMATION



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET INFORMATION
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control No. 1890--0004

Expiration Date: 02/28/2003

Name of Institution/Organization

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel						
2. Fringe Benefits						
3. Travel						
4. Equipment						
5. Supplies						
6. Contractual						
7. Construction						
8. Other						
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)						
10. Indirect Costs						
11. Training Stipends						
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)						

Name of Institution/Organization

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

**SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel						
2. Fringe Benefits						
3. Travel						
4. Equipment						
5. Supplies						
6. Contractual						
7. Construction						
8. Other						
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)						
10. Indirect Costs						
11. Training Stipends						
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)						

SECTION C - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION (see instructions)

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. This form is now undergoing OMB clearance and should be considered draft until a new valid OMB collection number is obtained.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to vary from 13 to 22 hours per response, with an average of 17.5 hours per response, including the time reviewing instructions, searching existing data resources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, DC 20202-4651; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1875-0102, Washington, DC 20503.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ED FORM 524

General Instructions

This form is used to apply to individual U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs. Unless directed otherwise, provide the same budget information for each year of the multi-year funding request. Pay attention to applicable program instructions if attached.

Section A – Budget Summary U.S. Department of Education Funds

All applicants must complete Section A and provide a breakdown by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-11.

Lines 1-11, columns (a)-(e):

For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Lines 1-11, column (f):

Show the multi-year total for each budget category. If funding is requested for only one project year, leave this column blank.

Line 12, columns (a)-(e):

Show the total budget request for each project year for which funding is requested.

Line 12, column (f):

Show the total amount requested for all project years. If funding is requested for only one year, leave this space blank.

Section B – Budget Summary Non-Federal Funds

If you are required to provide or volunteer to provide matching funds or other non-Federal resources to the project, these should be shown for each applicable budget category on lines 1-11 of Section B.

Lines 1-11, columns (a)-(e):

For each project year for which matching funds or other contributions are provided, show the total contribution for each applicable budget category.

Lines 1-11, column (f):

Show the multi-year total for each budget category. If non-Federal contributions are provided for only one year, leave this column blank.

Line 12, columns (a)-(e):

Show the total matching or other contribution for each project year.

Line 12, column (f):

Show the total amount to be contributed for all years of the multi-year project. If non-Federal contributions are provided for only one year, leave this space blank.

Section C – Other Budget Information

Pay attention to applicable program specific instructions, if attached.

1. Provide an itemized budget breakdown, by project year, for each budget category listed in Sections A and B.
2. If applicable to this program, enter the type of indirect rate (provisional, predetermined, final or fixed) that will be in effect during the funding period. In addition, enter the estimated amount of the base to which the rate is applied, and the total indirect expense.
3. If applicable to this program, provide the rate and base on which fringe benefits are calculated.
4. Provide other explanations or comments you deem necessary.

PART III - ASSURANCES, CERTIFICATIONS, DISCLOSURES

ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management, and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§ 290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874) and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§ 327-333), regarding labor standards for federally assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clear Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clear Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §1721 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead- based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, AAudits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.≡
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	TITLE	
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION		DATE SUBMITTED

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 34 CFR Part 82, "New Restrictions on Lobbying," and 34 CFR Part 85, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Education determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000, as defined at 34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.105 and 85.110--

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgement rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (2)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transaction (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610 -

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

~~As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.~~

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610-

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

NAME OF APPLICANT	PR/AWARD NUMBER AND / OR PROJECT NAME
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
SIGNATURE	DATE

Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352
(See reverse for public burden disclosure)

Type of Federal Action: _____ a. contract _____ b. grant _____ c. cooperative agreement _____ d. loan _____ e. loan guarantee _____ f. loan insurance		Status of Federal Action: _____ a. bid/offer/application _____ b. initial award _____ c. post-award		Report Type: _____ a. initial filing _____ b. material change For material change only: Year _____ quarter _____ Date of last report _____	
Name and Address of Reporting Entity: _____ Prime _____ Subawardee Tier _____, if Known: Congressional District, if known:			If Reporting Entity in No. 4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime: Congressional District, if known:		
6. Federal Department/Agency: 			7. Federal Program Name/Description: Federal Program Name/Description: CFDA Number, if applicable: _____		
8. Federal Action Number, if known: 			9. Award Amount, if known: Award Amount, if known: \$ _____		
10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant <i>(if individual, last name, first name, MI):</i> 			b. Individuals Performing Services <i>(including address if different from No. 10a)</i> <i>(last name, first name, MI):</i> 		
11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when this transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.			Signature: _____ Print Name: _____ Title: _____ Telephone No.: _____ Date: _____		
Federal Use Only			Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97)		

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF SF-LLL, DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

This disclosure form shall be completed by the reporting entity, whether subawardee or prime Federal recipient, at the initiation or receipt of a covered Federal action, or a material change to a previous filing, pursuant to title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. The filing of a form is required for each payment or agreement to make payment to any lobbying entity for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with a covered Federal action. Complete all items that apply for both the initial filing and material change report. Refer to the implementing guidance published by the Office of Management and Budget for additional information.

1. Identify the type of covered Federal action for which lobbying activity is and/or has been secured to influence the outcome of a covered Federal action.
2. Identify the status of the covered Federal action.
3. Identify the appropriate classification of this report. If this is a followup report caused by a material change to the information previously reported, enter the year and quarter in which the change occurred. Enter the date of the last previously submitted report by this reporting entity for this covered Federal action.
4. Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the reporting entity. Include Congressional District, if known. Check the appropriate classification of the reporting entity that designates if it is, or expects to be, a prime or subaward recipient. Identify the tier of the subawardee, e.g., the first subawardee of the prime is the 1st tier. Subawards include but are not limited to subcontracts, subgrants and contract awards under grants.
5. If the organization filing the report in item 4 checks "Subawardee," then enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the prime Federal recipient. Include Congressional District, if known.
6. Enter the name of the federal agency making the award or loan commitment. Include at least one organizational level below agency name, if known. For example, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard.
7. Enter the Federal program name or description for the covered Federal action (item 1). If known, enter the full Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for grants, cooperative agreements, loans, and loan commitments.
8. Enter the most appropriate Federal identifying number available for the Federal action identified in item 1 (e.g., Request for Proposal (RFP) number; Invitations for Bid (IFB) number; grant announcement number; the contract, grant, or loan award number; the application/proposal control number assigned by the Federal agency). Included prefixes, e.g., "RFP-DE-90-001."
9. For a covered Federal action where there has been an award or loan commitment by the Federal agency, enter the Federal amount of the award/loan commitment for the prime entity identified in item 4 or 5.
10. (a) Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the lobbying registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 engaged by the reporting entity identified in item 4 to influence the covered Federal action.
(b) Enter the full names of the individual(s) performing services, and include full address if different from 10(a). Enter Last Name, First Name, and Middle Initial (MI).
11. The certifying official shall sign and date the form, print his/her name, title, and telephone number.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB No. 0348-0046. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0046), Washington, DC 20503

**NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS:
The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)**

What is GPRA

The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 is a straightforward statute that requires all Federal agencies to manage their activities with attention to the consequences of those activities. Each agency is to clearly state what intends to accomplish, identify the resources required, and periodically report their progress to the Congress. In doing so, it is expected that GPRA will contribute to improvements in accountability for the expenditures of public funds, improve Congressional decision-making through more objective information on the effectiveness of Federal programs, and promote a new government focus on results, service delivery, and customer satisfaction.

How has the United States Department of Education Responded to the GPRA Requirements?

As required by GPRA, the United States Department of Education (the Department) has prepared a strategic plan for 1998-2002. This plan reflects the Department's priorities and integrates them with its mission and program authorities and describes how the Department will work to improve education for all children and adults in the United States. The Department's goals, as listed in the plan, are:

- Goal 1:* Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.
- Goal 2:* Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.
- Goal 3:* Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.
- Goal 4:* Make the United States Department of Education a high performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.

SECTION J

DUNS Number Instructions

D-U-N-S No.: Please provide the applicant's D-U-N-S Number. You can obtain your D-U-N-S Number at no charge by calling **1-800-333-0505** or by completing a D-U-N-S Number Request Form. The form can be obtained via the Internet at the following URL:

<http://www.dnb.com/dbis/aboutdb/intlduns.htm>

The D-U-N-S Number is a unique nine-digit number that does not convey any information about the recipient. A built in check digit helps assure the accuracy of the D-U-N-S Number. The ninth digit of each number is the check digit, which is mathematically related to the other digits. It lets computer systems determine if a D-U-N-S Number has been entered correctly.

Dun & Bradstreet, a global information services provider, has assigned D-U-N-S numbers to over 43 million companies worldwide.

SECTION K

APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Does your application include each of the following?

- ☐ Cover page (ED 424 form) signed by Certifying Official & all information correct
- ☐ DUNS number in block #2 of the ED 424 form
- ☐ Funding request does not exceed amount allowed for any year – ED 424, ED 524 & budget justification.
- ☐ Budget form (ED form 524)
- ☐ Budget narrative for each year
- ☐ One page abstract
- ☐ Program narrative, including response to the selection criteria & additional 10 points
- ☐ Assurances and Certifications [list]

Did You --

- ☐ Provide one (1) original plus 2 copies of the application (One original and six copies are requested)?
- ☐ Include all required forms with original signatures and dates?
- ☐ Include narrative on the Protection of Human Subjects?
- ☐ Mail* Application To: **OR** Hand deliver* Application To:

ATTN: 84.133A
U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202-4725

ATTN: 84.133A
U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
7th & D Streets, SW, ROB#3, Room 3633
Washington, DC 20202-4725

GRANT APPLICATION RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGMENT

If you fail to receive the notification of application receipt within fifteen (15) days from the closing date, call:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
(202) 708-9493

GRANT AND CONTRACT FUNDING INFORMATION

The Department of Education provides information about grant and contract opportunities electronically in several ways:

ED Internet Home Page <http://www.ed.gov/> (WWW address)